

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 13-22 are objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 14-17, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dozier (U.S. Patent 5,870,552). Claims 2 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dozier in view of Henderson (U.S. Patent 5,550,976).

Claims 13-22 have been amended to correct the minor informalities noted by the Examiner. Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out these minor informalities.

Regarding the non-statutory subject matter rejections, independent claim 12 has been amended to indicate that the claim is a means-plus-function. It appears that this language was omitted from the original claims as filed. Additionally, claim 12 has been amended to include structure such as a web server and a database as will be more fully described below. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments result in claim 12 being directed towards statutory subject matter.

Independent claims 1 and 12 have been amended to further clarify the intended thrust of the claims. The independent claims now more precisely recite that the database entries being searched by a user were initially posted by a content owner into the database utilizing a standard web browser to perform the interactions with the online database over a public network as originally claimed, and no additional user software is required to facilitate the interaction. As can be seen from FIGS. 2D-2T, the user

interacts with the online database through a conventional web browser, and no additional software is needed.

As noted previously, FIG. 3 of Dozier shows client software 60 on client machine 20d, and server software 50 on server machine 10d (misabeled in FIG. 3, *see* Col 5, lines 27-37). Dozier also states at Col. 5, lines 38-46:

As described in much greater detail below, client software 60 and server software 50 preferably share the responsibility for providing advantageous and innovative electronic publishing capabilities in accordance with the present invention. Note that a user of client computer 20d seeking the benefits of the present invention need only have client software 60 available on client computer 20d, and all or part of server software 50 available on server 10d (depending on the particular features desired).

Thus, the applications on the user's machine shares publishing capabilities with the software residing on the server side. The present invention as claimed does not require any such software be installed on either the server or clients machines, as the HTML-front ending tools of the present invention allow a user to interact directly with an online database through any machine running a standard web browser. FIGS 1A and 1B show how the HTML-front-ending tools receive page requests and return results in a page description language such as HTML.

Applicants note that the independent claims as originally presented included the limitation that the HTML front-ending tools are associated with the server site; thus, there is no need for any additional user-side software to facilitate electronic publishing. As is now claimed, electronic publishing may be accomplished using the HTML front-ending tools associated with the server, and only a standard web browser is required on the

user's machine as no additional software need be present as is required in Dozier. Users may then search the content over the Internet.

Applicants believe this functionality represents a significant and patentable advance over the state of the art at the time of the filing of this case. By facilitating electronic publishing using a standard web browser, the present invention provides for ubiquitous, cross-platform electronic publishing that may be accomplished with any machine that is capable of running a standard web browser. Such is not the case with Dozier, where electronic publishing may be accomplished only using their proprietary software running on machines compliant with their operating system of choice.

Thus, the present invention brings electronic publishing to anyone that can surf the Internet using a web browser. Applicants respectfully submit that providing users with such wide-spread publishing availability in 1995 represents a new, novel, and non-obvious solution to the hurdles of electronic publishing at that time.

It is respectfully submitted that Dozier does not teach or suggest a web server that allows a user to interact with a database using only a standard a web browser, as Dozier does not include such functionality. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Dozier.

Regarding dependent claims 2-11 and 13-22, it is believed that these claims are allowable as being dependent upon allowable base claims.

Specifically regarding claims 7 and 18, the Examiner has cited to Dozier for the limitation of "presenting a page containing a pre-sorted listing corresponding to the most common searches performed on said web site". Applicants respectfully disagree. The instant Specification at paragraph [52] states:

In one embodiment, searches may be performed by category, by keyword, by URL, or by example. To facilitate rapid retrieval of information, presorted listings may be stored for each category and keyword or for some number of the most common categories and keywords.

It is respectfully submitted that Dozier does not teach such functionality. Regarding the Examiner's citations to Figs 8a-b and Col. 3, no such functionality can be found. The discussion in Col. 3 lays out problems in the state of the art at the time of the filing of the Dozier and actually recites problems solved by the invention as now claimed, namely presenting increasing volumes of content to users in an efficient manner. Claims 7 and 18 accomplish this by facilitating the rapid retrieval of content by presorting listings based upon common searches, resulting in more efficient searching and a better user experience. It is respectfully submitted that Dozier does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 7 and 18, and that they are allowable over Dozier.

It is respectfully submitted that Dozier does not teach or suggest allowing interaction with an online database as claimed and now clarified. It is respectfully requested that the present Amendments and accompanying Remarks be considered and the pending case be reconsidered and moved to allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application or this response, the Examiner is personally invited to telephone the undersigned at 775-848-5624.

Respectfully submitted,  
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: January 30, 2007

/timothy a. brisson/

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.  
1657 Hwy 395, Suite 202  
Minden, NV 89423  
(775) 586-9500

Timothy A. Brisson  
Reg. No. 44,046